

**REMARKS**

A Requirement for Restriction was mailed in this case on March 9, 2004. Applicants elected with traverse Group I and subgroup B.

In a communication mailed on June 30, 2004, the Examiner required election of one species of:

- a. an epitope tag from *e.g.*, claim 9; and
- b. a reporter/effector moiety from *e.g.*, claim 10.

In response, Applicants elect the following species:

**a) For an epitope tag, Applicants elect "a His tag" from claim 9; and**

**b) For a reporter/effector, Applicants elect a "fluorescent label" from claim 10.**

With respect to the election of species, the Examiner is respectfully reminded that if there is a generic claim, the Examiner is to include "a complete action on the merits of all the claims readable on the elected species" MPEP 809.02(c). In addition, to the extent all species fall within the limitations of a generic claim ultimately determined to be patentable the non-elected species should no longer be deemed to be withdrawn and claims to the additional non-elected species should be considered by the Examiner.

Applicant's further note that the following pending claims are readable on the elected species (claims 1-15).

If a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (510) 769-3513.

QUINE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW  
GROUP, P.C.  
P.O. BOX 458  
Alameda, CA 94501  
Tel: 510 337-7871  
Fax: 510 337-7877

Respectfully submitted,



Tom Hunter  
Reg. No: 38,498